(26)

HIGH COURT OF CHHATTISGARH, BILASPUR

W.P.(S) No. 6087 of 2007

PETITIONER D.K. Kaushik Aged about 41 years S/o N.S. Kaushik Presently posted As In charge District project Co-ordinator, Korba R/o C-32 sector-2 Balco, District: Korba (C.G.)

Versus

RESPONDENTS

1. State of Chhattisgarh, Through: Secretary School Education Department D.K.S. Bhawan, Raipur.
2. State of Chhattisgarh Through : Secretary Tribal Welfare Department D.K.S. Bhawan, Raipur.
3. Director, Rajiv Gandhi Shiksha Mission State Project Office, Raipur District: Raipur (C.G.)
4. Shri Dinesh Jha S/o not Know by petitioner Project Director Bal Shramik Asharam Ambikapur (C.G.)

WRIT PETITION UNDER ARTICLE 226 OF THE CONSTITUION OF INDIA

Appearance:

Shri Sandeep Dubey, counsel for the petitioner.

Shri Ajay Dwivedi, Panel Lawyer for the State on advance copy.

ORAL ORDER
(10.10.2007)

SUNIL KUMAR SINHA, J.

Heard on admission.

By way of this Writ Petition filed under Article 226 of the Constitution of India, the petitioner has prayed for setting aside the order dated 21.9.2007 (Annexure-P/4), so far as it relates to respondent No.4, by which, respondent No.4, who is working as Project Director, Bal Shramik Asharam, Ambikapur, has been transferred to Zila Pariyozna Samanvayak, Rajeev Gandhi Shiksha Mission, Korba on deputation on administrative grounds.

Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that the petitioner holds the substantive post of Principal, Govt. Higher Secondary School, Balco and he was holding the additional charge of the post of District Project Co-ordinator, Rajeev Gandhi Shiksha

Mission, Korba where respondent No.4 is being brought on deputation, therefore, the order is affecting the petitioner.

I have considered the point raised by the learned counsel for the petitioner. In fact, the petitioner is working on the substantive post of Principal, Govt. Higher Secondary School, Balco and he was holding additional charge of District Project Co-ordinator by order dated 9.3.2006, as nobody was posted on the said post. But this time when a fresh person is being brought on deputation on the said post, and the substantive status of the petitioner is not being affected, which he was holding earlier to handing over the additional charge to him then subsequently he would have no *locus standi* for challenging such deputation. There is no substantial loss or loss according to lien of the petitioner. In fact, the petitioner has challenged the deputation of respondent No. 4 on the post of which he was holding the additional charge.

In the facts and circumstances of the case, I am not inclined to interfere with the order in this writ petition.

The petition has no merits, the same is liable to be dismissed and it is accordingly dismissed.

Sd/-
Sunil Kumar Sinha
Judge

vatti